

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are all the claims pending in the application.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,101,267 to Morales-Garza ("Morales-Garza") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,922 to Lazaris-Brunner et al. ("Lazaris-Brunner").

A. With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner maintains the position stated in the Office Action of April 17, 2008. Namely, the Examiner states that Morales-Garza teaches a satellite-based monitoring, measurement or data collection system comprising: a monitoring, measurement or data collection system having a plurality of monitoring stations (4) for remote monitoring, measurement or data collection and for providing data, to respective computation centers (3), and; a satellite system using at least one satellite (2) having an on-board processor for multiplexing up-link data received and broadcasting said multiplexed data in a down-link transmission; wherein: said up-link data received by said satellite (2) comprises a digital channel corresponding to a respective one of said computation centers (3); said respective computation center (3) is connected to a down-link adapter (7) connected to a receiver or group of receivers (6); and said down-link adapter is adapted for extracting, from said down-link transmission, said digital channel corresponding only to the said respective computation center (3).

The Examiner acknowledges that Morales-Garza does not teach the function of an adapter for extracting a digital channel but states that Lazaris-Brunner teaches such an adapter and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references as the Examiner describes.

Applicants submit the following:

(1) Applicants dispute the Examiner's characterization of the present claims in the Response to Arguments (p. 2) of the Office Action of October 1, 2008. The characterization does not accurately reflect all the features of Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Applicants submit that not all features of the claims have received due examination.

In particular, the Examiner offers no response to Applicants' submission that Morales-Garza does not teach "respective" computation centers (p. 4 and 6 of the Response of June 30, 2008). Nor does the Examiner respond to Applicants' submission that the simultaneous transmission on separate frequency bands taught by Morales-Garza does not encompass the presently claimed multiplexing (p. 5 and 6 of the Response of June 30, 2008).

(2) Applicants submit that Morales-Garza does not teach limitations presently claimed and that Lazaris-Brunner does not make up the deficiency to arrive at the present claims.

First, Morales-Garza does not teach "respective computation centers." The Examiner takes the position that column 3, lines 21-30 teach this recitation. Morales-Garza does teach a plurality of response units communicating with a plurality of local area repeater stations; but the local area repeater stations do not communicate with "respective computation centers." Instead, Morales-Garza teaches that "the repeater stations then communicate by intermediate satellite transmission channels to a central data center that receives the local signals to consolidate them into a nation-wide response result" (column 2, lines 15-19). The nature of invention of Morales-Garza is that a "network of local area audience response systems is coupled together at a *central audience response processing station* by means of a satellite communication system for real time audience response analysis, nationally or internationally" (Abstract, emphasis added).

Applicants further note that Morales-Garza teaches various features of local area repeater stations 3 but do not teach local area analyzing stations.

Accordingly, Morales-Garza does not teach a “digital channel corresponding to a respective one of said computation centers” because Morales-Garza teaches only a central data center rather than computation centers respective to a plurality of monitoring stations.

Second, Morales-Garza does not teach “an on-board processor for multiplexing up-link data received and broadcasting said multiplexed data in a down-link transmission.” The Examiner takes the position that column 3, lines 21-30 and column 4 lines 28-40 teach this feature. Morales-Garza, however, simply teaches that satellites may have equipment that “may distinguish between the transmissions from various local repeater stations to prevent interference or to permit simultaneous transmission on separate frequency bands” (column 4, lines 30-33).

Applicants respectfully submit that the simultaneous transmission on *separate frequency bands* taught by Morales-Garza does not encompass the presently claimed multiplexing. Applicants disclose at [0045] of the published application that the “satellite (2) comprises an on-board processor (21) of any type known in the related art, for receiving said up-link data, multiplexing said data into a bit stream and broadcasting the multiplexed data bit stream directly to a plurality of computation units (C).”

Third, Lazaris-Brunner does not teach a down-link adapter that is “adapted for extracting, from said down-link transmission, said digital channel corresponding only to the said respective computation center.” Rather Lazaris-Brunner teaches channels that do not correspond only to a particular computation center. A feature of the invention of Lazaris-Brunner is that “it provides the ability to map any uplink channel from either a global hub station or from a regional

programming station to any downlink beam, and provides on-the-fly re-mapping of the signals” (column 5, lines 3-6). That is, Lazaris-Brunner teaches away from the presently claimed feature.

Applicants submit that even if the references were combined, one of ordinary skill in the art would not (and could not) have arrived at the presently claimed system. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-13 and 20-25 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons directed to claim 1.

B. With respect to independent claim 14, the Examiner maintains the position stated in the Office Action of April 17, 2008. Namely, the Examiner states that Morales-Garza teaches a method for interconnecting elements of a monitoring, measurement or data collection using a satellite system, comprising: remote monitoring, measurement or data collection by means of a plurality of monitoring stations (4) and providing data to respective computation centers (3), and; at least one satellite (2) of said system multiplexing up-link data by means of an on-board processor and broadcasting said multiplexed data in down-link transmission; transmitting a digital channel in said up-link data to said satellite (2), said channel corresponding to a respective computation center (3), said computation center (3) being connected to a down-link adapter (7) connected to a satellite receiver or a group of satellite receivers (6); and extracting from said down-link transmission, by said down-link adapter, only said digital channel corresponding to the respective computation center (3).

(1) Applicants dispute the Examiner’s characterization of the present claims in the Response to Arguments (p. 2) of the Office Action of October 1, 2008. The characterization does not accurately reflect all the features of Applicants’ invention. Accordingly, Applicants submit that not all features of the claims have received due examination.

In particular, the Examiner offers no response to Applicants' submission that Morales-Garza does not teach "respective" computation centers (p. 4 and 6 of the Response of June 30, 2008). Nor does the Examiner respond to Applicants' submission that the simultaneous transmission on separate frequency bands taught by Morales-Garza does not encompass the presently claimed multiplexing (p. 5 and 6 of the Response of June 30, 2008).

(2) Applicants submit that Morales-Garza does not teach limitations presently claimed and that Lazaris-Brunner does not make up the deficiency to arrive at the present claims.

First, Morales-Garza does not teach "respective computation centers." The Examiner takes the position that column 3, lines 21-30 teach this recitation. Morales-Garza does teach a plurality of response units communicating with a plurality of local area repeater stations; but the local area repeater stations do not communicate with "respective computation centers." Instead, Morales-Garza teaches that "the repeater stations then communicate by intermediate satellite transmission channels to a central data center that receives the local signals to consolidate them into a nation-wide response result" (column 2, lines 15-19). The nature of invention of Morales-Garza is that a "network of local area audience response systems is coupled together at a *central audience response processing station* by means of a satellite communication system for real time audience response analysis, nationally or internationally" (Abstract, emphasis added).

Accordingly, Morales-Garza does not teach a "digital channel corresponding to a respective one of said computation centers" because Morales-Garza teaches only a central data center rather than computation centers respective to a plurality of monitoring stations.

Second, Morales-Garza does not teach "an on-board processor for multiplexing up-link data received and broadcasting said multiplexed data in a down-link transmission." The

Examiner takes the position that column 3, lines 21-30 and column 4 lines 28-40 teach this recitation. Morales-Garza, however, simply teaches that satellites may have equipment that “may distinguish between the transmissions from various local repeater stations to prevent interference or to permit simultaneous transmission on separate frequency bands” (column 4, lines 30-33).

Applicant respectfully submits that the simultaneous transmission on *separate frequency bands* taught by Morales-Garza does not encompass the presently claimed multiplexing. Applicant discloses at [0045] of the published application that the “satellite (2) comprises an on-board processor (21) of any type known in the related art, for receiving said up-link data, multiplexing said data into a bit stream and broadcasting the multiplexed data bit stream directly to a plurality of computation units (C).”

Third, Lazaris-Brunner does not teach a down-link adapter that is “adapted for extracting, from said down-link transmission, said digital channel corresponding only to the said respective computation center.” Rather Lazaris-Brunner teaches channels that do not correspond only to a particular computation center. A feature of the invention of Lazaris-Brunner is that “it provides the ability to map any uplink channel from either a global hub station or from a regional programming station to any downlink beam, and provides on-the-fly re-mapping of the signals” (column 5, lines 3-6). That is, Lazaris-Brunner teaches away from the present claimed feature.

Applicant submits that even if the references were combined, one of ordinary skill in the art would not (and could not) have arrived at the presently claimed system. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 15-19 depend from independent claim 14 and are allowable for at least the reasons directed to claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 31, 2008


Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234